REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's withdrawal of the previous rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Shaw et al. in view of the applicants arguments filed March 26, 2009 is acknowledged with appreciation.

I. Claim Amendments and Basis Therefore

In response to the final Office Action of March 15, 2010, the applicant has amended independent claims 32, 33, and 34 to replace the word "creating" with "that is located between", which is based on the language used in the textual specification of Figure 10C in the application as originally filed.

Claims 32 and 34 have also been amended to require that the one or more processing units of the microprocessor that are included in the unprotected portion of the microchip be separate from and located outside of said internal hardware firewall. A parallel amendment has been made to claim 33 to require that the one or more microprocessors that are included in the unprotected portion of the computer be separate from and located outside of said internal hardware firewall. These amendments find support in Figures 10A-10D and 10J-10Q, and the textual explanation of these figures found in the specification.

Claims 33 and 34 also include minor corrections made by deleting the word "personal" before "computer" and adding the missing word "the" at one location in claim 33.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2-25, 27-28, and 30-34 will remain pending in the present application.

II. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 2-4, 7-13, 19, 22-25 and 27-34 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent no. 5,896,499 (McKelvey) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested for the reasons which follow.

Independent claims 32 and 34 require that the internal hardware firewall be located between an unprotected portion and a protected portion of the computer. Claims 32 and 34 also require that the one or more processing units of the microprocessor that are included in the unprotected portion of the microchip be separate from and located outside of said internal hardware firewall. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner relies on the embedded security processor 173 of McKelvey as providing one or more processing units of the microprocessor in the unprotected portion of the computer. See e.g. p. 4, fourth paragraph and p. 8, third paragraph of the Final Office Action.

The "embedded security processor 173" of McKelvey is clearly identified together with I/O memory 171 as part of the expansion board 170 of McKelvey. Expansion board 170 of McKelvey provides enhanced firewall capabilities for networked computer resources. See col. 7, lines 22-26 of McKelvey. Further, expansion board 170 of McKelvey appears to have no function other than the provision of security within the firewall protected computer system 100. Figure 3 of McKelvey labels each of computer system 100 and firewall protected computer systems 220 as a "FIREWALL PROTECTED COMPUTER SYSTEM". McKelvey also notes that, "In order to provide firewall security protection against unwanted traffic over an unsecure network such as the Internet, network interface 177 located on expansion board 170 can be connected to the unsecure network." See col. 8, lines 12-15 of McKelvey.

McKelvey discloses no microprocessors other than the microprocessors which make up the main processor 110 and the CPU or specialized microprocessors which make up the embedded security processor 173 of the expansion board 170 which provides the enhanced firewall capabilities of McKelvey. Thus, McKelvey does not disclose any microprocessors located in the unprotected portion of the computer system 100 as now claimed by the applicant. Instead, all of the microprocessors in McKelvey appear to be located either in the protection portion (e.g. those making up the main processor 110) or are part of the embedded security processor 173 which provides the enhanced firewall capabilities and is therefore necessarily located between the protected portion and the unprotected portion, not included in the unprotected portion, as now claimed by the applicant.

In addition, the security processor of McKelvey is not separate from a hardware firewall, as now claimed by the applicant. Rather, the security processor of McKelvey itself makes up the firewall and thus cannot be separate from the firewall.

In summary, then, the applicant clearly recites in newly amended claims 32-34 two hardware components, both a hardware firewall 50 and at least one unprotected processing unit 94 (or microprocessor 40) that is separate from and located outside of the hardware firewall 50. In contrast, McKelvey discloses only a hardware firewall in the form of a security processor 173. McKelvey discloses no separate processing unit or microprocessor that is separate from and located outside the hardware firewall (security processor 173).

Claim 33 requires that one or more microprocessors that are included in the unprotected portion of the computer are separate from and located outside of said internal hardware firewall. Thus, the same arguments as given above demonstrating the novelty of claims 32 and 34 also apply to claim 33.

Claims 2-25, 27-28, and 30-31 all depend from one of claims 32-34 and thus the same arguments apply to these claims as to claims 32-34. Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, favorable consideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over McKelvey is requested.

Claims 5-6 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKelvey as applied to claim 32 above and further in view of Romig et al. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested for the reasons which follow.

As discussed above, McKelvey does not disclose any microprocessors separate from and located outside a hardware firewall nor any microprocessors located in an unprotected portion of the computer system 100. Romig et al. does not cure this deficiency of McKelvey. Accordingly, claims 5-6 and 20 are considered to be patentable over a combination of McKelvey and Romig et al. for at least this reason. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Claims 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKelvey as applied to claim 32 above and further in view of Shaw et al. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested for the reasons which follow.

As discussed above, McKelvey does not disclose any microprocessors separate from and located outside a hardware firewall nor any microprocessors located in an unprotected portion of the computer system 100. Shaw et al. does not cure this deficiency of McKelvey since the Examiner conceded in the final rejection that Shaw et al. does not show an internal firewall located between a protected portion of a microchip and an unprotected portion of the microchip. Accordingly, claims 14-18 are considered to be patentable over a combination of McKelvey and Shaw et al. for at least this reason. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKelvey as applied to claim 32 above and further in view of U.S. Patent no. 5,497,465 (Chin et al.). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested for the reasons which follow.

As discussed above, McKelvey does not disclose any microprocessors separate from and located outside a hardware firewall nor any microprocessors located in an unprotected portion of the computer system 100. Chin does not cure this deficiency of McKelvey. Accordingly, claim 21 is considered to be patentable over a combination of McKelvey and Chin for at least this reason. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is requested.

III. Terminal Disclaimer

In order to expedite allowance of the present application, applicant hereby submits a Terminal Disclaimer of the present application over prior U.S. Patent no. 6,725,250.

Favorable consideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please charge any shortage in the fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 9, 2010

Roland McAndrews
Reg. No. 41,450